

Assessment of the Implementation of RTE Act, 2009, in Context of Curriculum in Government and Private Elementary Schools of western Uttar Pradesh

MUDITA SHARMA* NIKHAT YASMIN SHAFEEQ**

Abstract

The present paper seeks to find out the status of the implementation of Right to Education (RTE) Act-2009, in the elementary schools of western Uttar Pradesh in the light of the norms prescribed in the RTE Act in context of curriculum. The Act was passed in 2009 and came into force since 1st April, 2010. About ten years of the implementation of the Act, researchers attempted to find out the status of its implementation according to the provisions of curriculum. A self-made tool was used by the researchers to assess the implementation of the RTE Act. Both quantitative and qualitative analysis was performed. Coding, scoring of the data and analysis was done by using the SPSS software. The statistical techniques used for analysing the data were: percentage, t-test and graphs. It was found that some of the provisions of the RTE Act in context of curriculum are followed in the elementary schools of western U.P.

* Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Regional Institute of Education, Bhopal, India.

** Associate Professor, Section of Education, Women's College, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, India.

INTRODUCTION

Right to Education Act-2009 came into force on 1st April 2010 as a fundamental right in India. Chapter V of RTE Act deals with curriculum and completion of elementary education. As it is evident that curriculum is an important aspect of our elementary education system which lays special focus on improving the quality of education. NCF-2005 provides a framework along with the guiding principles for making the curriculum and school environment child-friendly that is, free of stress and fear.

Following are some of the salient features of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, as stated by Bairagya, R. and Bairagya, S. (2011)—

- Free and compulsory education to all children of India between six to fourteen age groups;
- No child shall be held back, expelled or required to pass a board examination until completion of elementary education;
- A child above six years of age has not been admitted in any school or though admitted, could not complete the elementary education, then, they shall be admitted in a class appropriate to their age; provided that where a child is directly admitted in a class appropriate to their age, then, they shall, in order to be at par with others, have a right to receive special training, in such manner, and within such time limits, as may be prescribed: provided the child so admitted to elementary education shall be entitled to free education till completion of elementary education even after fourteen years;
- For the purpose of admission to elementary education, the age of a child shall be determined on the basis of the birth certificate issued in accordance with the provisions of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, 1856 or on the basis of such other document, as may be prescribed. No child shall be denied admission in a school for lack of age proof;
- A child who completes elementary education shall be awarded a certificate;
- Calls for a fixed student-teacher ratio;
- Will apply to all of India except Jammu and Kashmir;
- Provides for 25 per cent reservation for economically disadvantaged communities in admission to Class I in all private schools;
- Mandates improvement in quality of education;
- School teachers will need adequate professional degree within five years or else will lose job;
- School infrastructure (where there is a problem) to be improved in three years, else recognition shall remain cancelled;
- Financial burden will be shared between state and central government.

Rekha, C 2011 analyses access provisions under the RTE Act, 2009 and SSA, and declares that access does not constitute mere physical availability of school; it implied facilitating full, free and joyful participation of children in learning. Interventions for universalising access, therefore, cannot be limited to school infrastructure, residential facilities or transportation, but must encompass curriculum, including 'hidden' curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. Equitable access must amalgamate with equitable quality to institutionalism and sustain universal access.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The present study is based on the following objective:

1. To assess the implementation of RTE Act in context of curriculum among the private and secondary elementary schools of Western U.P.

As we know that curriculum is the backbone of any educational institution and is a quite wide area, the researchers therefore have taken only the following criteria of curriculum in this study:

1. NCF (2005) is followed or not.
2. Children are taught in their mother tongue.
3. Curriculum helps to assess the creativity.
4. Curriculum gives importance to rote memorisation.

5. Curriculum helps to assess the intellect of the students.
6. Curriculum gives emphasis to personality development.
7. Curriculum helps in sharpening the communicative skills of the students.
8. Curriculum helps in building the confidence level of the students.
9. Curriculum helps in the psychomotor development of the students.
10. Curriculum helps in developing an aesthetic sense among the students.
11. CCE is undertaken for understanding of child's knowledge.
12. Examination is required to promote the child for the next higher class.
13. Child is awarded a certificate after completing the elementary education.

METHODOLOGY

The population of the study consists of the principals and teachers of all the government and private elementary schools of western Uttar Pradesh. Sample of the study constitute 731 Teachers, 60 Principals and Vice-Principals from 4 districts of western Uttar Pradesh, i.e., Aligarh, Etawah, Hathras and Muzaffar Nagar. The sample was selected by using purposive sampling technique.

For collecting data, the Investigator personally visited Elementary schools and

Analysis and interpretation

Table 1
NCF (2005) is followed or not

Do you follow NCF 2005?	Principal						Teachers					
	Private		Government		Total		Private		Government		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	25	75.8	20	74.1	45	75.0	371	87.3	253	82.7	624	85.4
No	-	-	5	18.5	5	8.3	9	2.1	34	11.1	43	5.9
No Response	8	24.2	2	7.4	10	16.7	45	10.6	19	6.2	64	8.8
Total	33	100	27	100	60	100	425	100	306	100	731	100

contacted the Principals and Vice-Principals, and Teachers of schools to administer self-made Information Schedules on them. Seven categories were made in the tool according to the guidelines of the Right to Education Act, 2009. The first category consists of 5 items regarding personal information of the respondents which include the name, administrative experience, teaching experience, academic and professional qualifications and employment status of the respondents. In second category 6 items were framed which seek information about level, nature, etc., of the School. To check the awareness level of the respondents about the RTE (2009), third category was framed of 3 items. Fourth category was comprised of 7 items about the management and administrative policies. It tends to elicit the information about the admission process and the provisions that are followed. Fifth category consists of 6 items related with teacher's eligibility criteria and their teaching, whereas 13 items related with the curriculum are included in the sixth category. The last, i.e., seventh category included 8 items about the functions of the School Management Committees. In the end there is an open-ended question seeking suggestions for the effective implementation of RTE. Useful suggestions given by the experts were incorporated.

Reliability of Information Schedule was calculated by using test-retest method, which equals to 0.84 and content validity was found to be high. Coding, scoring of the data and analysis was done by using the SPSS software. The statistical techniques used for analysing the data were: percentage, t-test and graphs.

Table 1 shows whether National Curriculum Framework (2005), is followed or not in the Schools. An aggregate of 74.1 per cent principals, out of which 75.8 per cent were private and 74.1 per cent government agreed to the fact that NCF is followed in their schools. Similarly, 87.3 per cent private and 82.7 per cent government school teachers, with an aggregate of 85.4 per cent agreed to it. But, not a single private school principal and only 5 per cent government school principals agreed that NCF is not followed in their school. While, 2.1 per cent private and 11.1 per cent government teachers agreed that NCF is not followed in their schools. A total of 16.7 per cent principals and 8.8 per cent teachers did not respond to the question. Table 1 represents the above data.

Table 2 shows the difference between the responses of principals and teachers regarding the norms of NCF (2005). The obtained t-value of private and government school principals is 2.04 which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of private school principals (1.75) is more than government school principals (1.74). So, it means that private schools follow NCF (2005) more in comparison to government schools according to the responses of the principals. The obtained t-value of private and government school teachers is 0.03 which is non-significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, it indicates that the private and government school teachers' responses do not differ in following the norms of NCF (2005).

Table 2
Shows the difference between the responses of Principals and Teachers in following the NCF (2005)

Do you follow NCF 2005?	Principal				t	Teachers				T	
	Private		Government			Private		Government			S.D.
	N	Score	N	Score		N	Score	N	Score		
Yes	25	50	20	40	df=58	371	742	253	506	0.50	df=729
No	-	-	5	5	2.04*	9	9	34	34	0.59	0.03**
No Response	8	8	2	2		45	45	19	19		
Total	33	50	27	47		425	796	301	559		
Mean Score		1.75		1.74			1.87		1.82		

* Significant at 0.05 level

** Non-significant at 0.05 level

Table 3
Children are taught in their mother tongue

Children are taught in their mother tongue	Principal						Teachers							
	Private			Government			Total		Private		Government		Total	
	N	%		N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	12	36.4	24	88.9	36.0	60	137	32.2	226	73.9	363	49.7		
Sometimes	17	51.5	3	11.1	20.0	33.3	258	60.7	64	20.9	322	44.0		
Never	3	9.1	-	-	3	5	21	4.9	12	3.9	33	4.5		
No Response	1	3.0	-	-	1	1.7	9	2.1	4	1.3	13	1.8		
Total	33	100	27	100	60	100	425	100	306	100	731	100		

Table 3 provides responses to the question that children are taught in their mother tongue or not. A total of 60 per cent principals responded to the option 'Always' out of which 36.4 per cent were private and 88.9 per cent were government school principals. In the same way, 32.2 per cent private and 73.9 per cent were government school teachers with a total of 49.7 per cent responded to it. 'Sometimes' was marked as a response by 51.5 per cent private and 11.1 per cent government school principals with an aggregate of 33.3 per cent. Similarly, 60.7 per cent private and 20.9 per cent government teachers also marked it. 'Never' as a response was marked by 9.1 per cent private and not by any government principal. A total of 4.5 per cent teachers, out of which 4.9 per cent were private and 3.9 per cent were government teachers also marked it. Table 3 represents the above data.

Table 4 shows the significant difference between the responses of private and government school principals and teachers by using t-test. The obtained t-value of principals is 4.42, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of government school principals (2.88) is more in comparison to the mean score of private school principals (2.24). Whereas, in case of teachers the t-value is found to be 10.48 which is also significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of government school teachers (2.68) is more in comparison to the mean score of private school teachers (2.25). So, the mean score of both private and government school principals and teachers is favoring towards the government schools. Therefore, it indicates that in government schools children are taught in their mother tongue.

Table 4
Shows difference between the responses of Principals and Teachers finding whether the children are taught in their mother tongue

Children are taught in their mother tongue	Principal				Teachers				t
	Private		Government		Private		Government		
	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	
Always	12	36	24	72	137	411	226	678	df=729
Sometimes	17	34	3	6	258	516	64	128	0.57
Never	3	3	-	-	21	21	12	12	10.48*
No response	1	1	-	-	9	9	4	4	
Total	33	74	27	78	425	957	306	822	
Mean Score		2.24		2.88		2.25		2.68	

*Significant at 0.01 level

Table 5
Curriculum helps to assess the creativity

The curriculum helps to assess the creativity of the students	Principal				Teachers							
	Private		Government		Private		Government					
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%				
Yes	29	87.9	25	92.6	54	90	371	87.3	263	85.9	634	86.7
Somewhat	4	12.1	1	3.7	5	8.3	38	8.9	35	11.4	73	10.0
No	-	-	1	3.7	1	1.7	3	0.7	1	0.3	4	0.5
No Response	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	3.1	7	2.3	20	2.7
Total	33	100	27	100.0	60	100	425	100	306	100	731	100

Table 6
Shows difference between the responses of Principals and Teachers finding whether the curriculum helps to assess the creativity of the students

The curriculum helps to assess the creativity of the students	Principal						Teachers					
	Private		Government		S.D.	t	Private		Government		S.D.	T
	N	Score	N	Score			N	Score	N	Score		
Yes	29	87	25	75	0.33	df=58	371	1113	263	789		df=729
Somewhat	4	8	1	2	0.42	0.10**	38	76	35	70	0.44	0.07**
No	-	-	1	1			3	3	1	1		
No Response	-	-	-	-			13	13	7	7		
Total	33	95	27	78			425	1205	306	867		
Mean Score		2.87		2.88				2.83		2.83		

**Non- Significant at 0.05 level

Table 5 shows whether the curriculum helps to assess the creativity of the students or not. A total of 90 per cent principals agreed to the statement out of which 87.9 per cent were private and 92.6 per cent were government school principals. Similarly, 87.3 per cent private and 85.9 per cent government teachers also agreed to it with an aggregate of 86.7 per cent. ‘Somewhat’ as a response was marked by a total of 8.3 per cent principals, with 12.1 per cent private and 3.7 per cent government school principals. A total of 10 per cent teachers also responded to it, out of which 8.9 per cent were private and 11.4 per cent were government school teachers. Not a single private government school principals disagreed to the statement while, 3.1 per cent private and 2.3 per cent government school teachers with an aggregate of 2.7 per cent also disagreed to the statement. Table 5 represents the above data.

Table 6 shows the insignificant difference between the responses of

principals and teachers in finding out if the curriculum helps to assess the creativity of the students or not. The obtained t-value of private and government school principals is 0.10 which is non-significant at 0.05 level of significance. Similarly, the obtained t-value of private and government school teachers is 0.07 which is also non-significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, it indicates that both the private and government school principals and teachers' responses do not differ regarding that the curriculum helps to assess the creativity of the students.

Table 7 assesses whether the curriculum gives importance to rote memorisation or not. To the response of this, a total of 66.7 per cent principals agreed; out of which 60.6 per cent were private school principals and 74.1 per cent were government school principals. In the same way, 61.4 per cent private and 67.6 per cent government school teachers agreed to it with an aggregate of 64.0 per cent. 'Somewhat' was marked by 18.2 per cent private and 3.7 per cent government school principals, with a total of 11.7 per cent principals. Similarly, 15.1 per cent private and 20.6 per cent government teachers also responded to it with a total of 17.4 per cent. But, 18.2 per cent private and 11.1 per cent government principals with a total of 15 per cent disagreed to the statement. A total of 14.1 per cent teachers, out of which 19.8 per cent were private and 6.2 per cent were government

Table 7
Gives importance to rote memorisation

Gives importance to rote memorisation	Principal				Teachers							
	Private		Government		Total		Private		Government		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	20	60.6	20	74.1	40	66.7	261	61.4	207	67.6	468	64.0
Somewhat	6	18.2	1	3.7	7	11.7	64	15.1	63	20.6	127	17.4
No	6	18.2	3	11.1	9	15	84	19.8	19	6.2	103	14.1
No Response	1	3.0	3	11.1	4	6.7	16	3.8	17	5.6	33	4.5
Total	33	100	27	100	60	100	425	100	306	100	731	100

Table 8
Shows difference between the responses of Principals and Teachers finding if the curriculum gives importance to rote memorisation

Gives importance to rote memorisation	Principal				Teachers				T
	Private		Government		Private		Government		
	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	
Yes	20	60	20	60	261	783	207	621	df=729 2.5*
Somewhat	6	12	1	2	64	128	63	126	
No	6	6	3	3	84	84	19	19	
No Response	1	1	3	3	16	16	17	17	
Total	33	789	27	68	425	1011	306	783	
Mean Score		2.39		2.51		2.37		2.55	

* Significant at 0.05 level

**Non-significant at 0.05 level

teachers also disagreed to it. Table 7 represents the above data.

Table 8 shows the difference between the responses of principals and teachers finding whether the curriculum gives importance to rote memorisation. The obtained t-value of private and government school principals is 0.17 which is non-significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, it indicates that the private and government school principals do not differ regarding that the curriculum gives importance to rote memorisation. Also, the obtained t-value of private and government school teachers is 2.5 which are significant at 0.05 levels. The mean score of government school teachers (2.55) is more than private school teachers (2.37), so it indicates that according to the responses of teachers, the government schools give importance to rote memorisation in comparison to private schools.

Table 9 finds out whether the curriculum helps to assess the intellect of the students or not. An aggregate of 83.3 per cent principals gave their response in affirmation, out of which 87.9 per cent were private and 77.8 per cent were government principals. Similarly, 86.1 per cent private and 85.3 per cent government teachers with a total of 85.8 per cent also answered in affirmation. The response 'Somewhat' was marked by 3 per cent private and

14.8 per cent government school principals with a total of 8.3 per cent. A total of 9.4 per cent teachers with 9.4 per cent as private and 9.5 per cent as government teachers also responded to it. While, a total of 6.7 per cent principals disagreed to the statement, out of which 6.1 per cent were private and 7.4 per cent were government principals. In the same way, 0.2 per cent private and 2.3 per cent government teachers also disagreed to it with an aggregate of 1.1 per cent. Table 9 represents the above data.

Table 10 shows the difference between the responses of principals and teachers finding whether the curriculum helps to enhance the intellect of the students or not. The obtained t-value of private and government school principals is 0.31 which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. Similarly, the obtained t-value of private and government school teachers is 0.47 which is insignificant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, it indicates that both the private and government school principals and teachers' responses do not differ regarding that the curriculum helps to enhance the intellect of the students.

Table 11 depicts whether curriculum gives emphasis to personality development or not. A total of 85 per cent principals agreed to the statement, out of which 90.9 per cent were private school principals and 77.8 per cent were government school principals. Similarly, 82.8

Table 9
Helps to enhance the intellect

Helps to enhance the intellect of the students	Principal				Teachers							
	Private		Government		Total		Private		Government		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	29	87.9	21	77.8	50	83.3	366	86.1	261	85.3	627	85.8
Somewhat	1	3.0	4	14.8	5	8.3	40	9.4	29	9.5	69	9.4
No	2	6.1	2	7.4	4	6.7	1	0.2	7	2.3	8	1.1
No Response	1	3.0	-	-	1	1.7	18	4.2	9	2.9	27	3.7
Total	33	100	27	100	60	100	425	100	306	100	731	100

Table 10
Shows difference between the responses of Principals and Teachers finding whether the curriculum helps to enhance the intellect of the students

Helps to enhance the intellect of the students	Principal				Teachers				t
	Private		Government		Private		Government		
	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	
Yes	29	87	21	63	366	1098	261	783	df=729
Somewhat	1	2	4	8	40	80	29	58	0.54
No	2	2	2	2	1	1	7	7	0.47**
No Response	1	1	-	-	18	18	9	9	
Total	33	93	27	73	425	1197	306	857	
Mean Score		2.81		2.70		2.81		2.80	

**Non-significant at 0.05 level

Table 11
Gives emphasis to personality development

Gives emphasis to personality development	Principal				Teachers							
	Private		Government		Private		Government					
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%				
Yes	30	90.9	21	77.8	51	85	367	86.4	230	75.2	597	82.8
Somewhat	3	9.1	3	11.1	6	10	47	11.1	67	21.9	114	15.8
No	-	-	1	3.7	1	1.7	3	0.7	3	1.0	6	0.8
No Response	-	-	2	7.4	2	3.3	8	1.9	6	2.0	14	1.9
Total	33	100	27	100	60	100	425	100	306	100	721	100

per cent teachers also agreed to this statement among whom 86.4 per cent were private school teachers and 75.2 per cent were government school teachers. To the response ‘Somewhat’ only 10 per cent principals responded, out of which 9.1 per cent were private and 11.1 per cent were government principals. Among teachers, a total of 15.8 per cent marked this response, out of which 11.1 per cent were private and 21.9 per cent were government teachers. Not a single private school principal disagreed to the statement, but 3.7 per cent government principals disagreed to it. Whereas, a total of 0.8 per cent teachers disagreed to the statement, among them 0.7 per cent were private and 1.0 per cent were government teachers. Table 11 represents the above data.

Table 12 shows the significant difference between the responses of private and government school principals and teachers by using t-test. The mean score of private school principals (2.9) is more than government school principals (2.66). The obtained t-value of principals is 1.92, which is non-significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of private school teachers (2.83) is more than government school teachers (2.72). The t-value is found to

Table 12
Shows the difference between the responses of Principals and Teachers finding whether the curriculum gives emphasis to personality development

Gives emphasis to personality development	Principal						Teachers					
	Private		Government		S.D.	t	Private		Government		S.D.	t
	N	Score	N	Score			N	Score	N	Score		df=729
Yes	30	90	21	63	0.29		367	1101	230	690		
Somewhat	3	6	3	6	0.88	1.92**	47	94	67	134	0.40	3.5*
No	-	-	1	1			3	3	3	3		
No Response	-	-	2	2			8	8	6	6		
Total	33	96	27	72			425	1206	302	833		
Mean Score		2.90		2.66				2.83		2.72		

*Significant at 0.05 level

**Non-significant at 0.05 level

Table 13
Helps in sharpening the communicative skills

Helps in sharpening the communicative skills of the students	Principal				Teachers							
	Private		Government		Total		Private		Government		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	29	87.9	22	81.5	51	85	358	84.2	228	74.5	586	80.2
Somewhat	3	9.1	4	14.8	7	11.7	57	13.4	62	20.3	119	16.3
No	1	3.0	1	3.7	2	3.3	2	0.5	10	3.3	12	1.6
No Response	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	1.9	6	2.0	14	1.9
Total	33	100	27	100	60	100	425	100	306	100	731	100

be 3.5 which are significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, it indicates that in government schools the curriculum gives emphasis to personality development.

Table 13 finds out whether the curriculum helps in sharpening the communicative skills of the students or not. A total of 85 per cent principals agreed, among whom 87.9 per cent were private and 81.5 per cent were government school principals. In the same way, a total of 80.2 per cent teachers also agreed to it; out of which 84.2 per cent were private and 74.5 per cent were government school teachers. 'Somewhat' was marked as a response by 11.7 per cent principals among whom 9.1 per cent were private school principals and 14.8 per cent were government school principals. A total of 16.3 per cent teachers also marked it as a response, out of which 13.4 per cent were private and 20.3 per cent were government school teachers. Some principals disagreed to the statement with a total of 3.3 per cent, out of which 3 per cent were private and 3.7 per cent were government school principals. Similarly, a total of 1.6 per cent teachers disagreed to the statement out of which 0.5 per cent were private and 3.3 per cent were government school teachers. Table 13 represents the above data.

Table 14 shows the difference between the responses of private and government school principals and teachers by using t-test. The obtained t-value of principals is 0.57, which is non-significant at 0.05 level

of significance. It means that private and government school principals do not differ regarding that the curriculum helps in sharpening the communicative skills of the students. Whereas in case of teachers, the t-value is found to be 3.61 which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of private school teachers (2.81) is more than government school teachers (2.67). So, it indicates that according to the responses of teachers in private schools the curriculum helps in sharpening the communicative skills of the students more in comparison to government school teachers.

Table 15 assesses whether the curriculum helps in building the confidence level of the students or not. A total of 85 per cent principals agreed to the statement, out of which 90.9 per cent were private and 77.8 per cent were government school principals. Similarly, 81.5 per cent teachers also agreed to the statement among whom 86.4 per cent were private and 74.8 per cent were government teachers. ‘Somewhat’ as a response, was marked by an aggregate of 11.7 per cent principals with 6.1 per cent as private and 18.5 per cent as government school principals. 15.3 per cent teachers also marked it, out of which 11.1 per cent were private and 21.2 per cent were government school

Table 14
Shows the difference between the responses of Principals and Teachers finding whether the curriculum helps in sharpening the communicative skills of the students or not

Helps in sharpening the communicative skills of the students	Principal						Teachers										
	Private		S.D.		Government		S.D.		Private		Government		S.D.		t		
	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score			
Yes	29	87			22	66			358	1074			228	684			df=729
Somewhat	3	6	0.44		4	8	0.50		57	114	0.41		62	124	0.56		3.61*
No	1	1			1	1			2	2			10	10			
No Response	-	-			-	-			8	8			6	6			
Total	33	94			27	75			425	1198			306	824			
Mean Score		2.84				2.77				2.81				2.67			

**Not significant at 0.05 level

*Significant at 0.05 level

Table 15
Helps in building the confidence level

Helps in building the confidence level of the students	Principal						Teachers											
	Private			Government			Total			Private			Government			Total		
	N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%	
Yes	30	90.9	21	77.8	51	85	367	86.4	229	74.8	596	81.5						
Somewhat	2	6.1	5	18.5	7	11.7	47	11.1	65	21.2	112	15.3						
No	1	3.0	1	3.7	2	3.3	2	0.5	3	1.0	5	0.7						
No Response	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	2.1	9	2.9	18	2.5						
Total	33	100	27	100	60	100	425	100	306	100	731	100						

Table 16
Shows difference between the responses of Principals and Teachers finding whether the curriculum helps in building the confidence level of the students or not

Helps in building the confidence level of the students	Principal						Teachers											
	Private			Government			Total			Private			Government			Total		
	N	Score		N	Score		N	Score		N	Score		N	Score		N	Score	
Yes	30	90	0.41	21	63	df=58	367	1101		229	687	df=729						
Somewhat	2	4		5	10	1.13**	47	94	0.52	65	130	0.56						
No	1	1		1	1		2	2	0.41	3	3	3.84*						
No Response	-	-		-	-		9	9		9	9							
Total	33	95		27	74		425	1206		306	829							
Mean Score		2.87			2.74			2.83			2.70							

**Not significant at 0.05 level

*Significant at 0.01 level

teachers. A total of 3.3 per cent principals disagreed to the statement with 3 per cent as private and 3.7 per cent as government school principals. In the same way, an aggregate of 0.7 per cent teachers disagreed to the statement with 0.5 per cent private and 1.0 per cent as government school teachers. Table 15 represents the above data.

Table 16 shows the difference between the responses of private and government school principals and teachers by using t-test. The obtained t-value of principals is 1.13, which is non-significant at 0.05 level of significance. It means that private and government school principals do not differ regarding that the curriculum helps in building the confidence level of the students. Whereas in case of teachers, the t-value is found to be 3.84 which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of private school teachers (2.83) is more than government school teachers (2.70). Therefore, it indicates that according to private school teachers the curriculum helps in building the confidence level of the students more in comparison to government school teachers.

Table 17 finds out if the curriculum helps in the psychomotor development of the students. An aggregate of 65 per cent principals agreed to the statement, among whom 63.6 per cent were private and 66.7 per cent were government principals. A total of 78.1 per cent teachers agreed to the statement

Table 17
Helps students in their psychomotor development

Helps students in their psychomotor development	Principal						Teachers					
	Private		Government		Total		Private		Government		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	21	63.6	18	66.7	39	65	335	78.8	236	77.1	571	78.1
Somewhat	7	21.2	6	22.2	13	21.7	71	16.7	53	17.3	124	16.9
No	1	3.0	1	3.7	2	3.3	3	0.7	4	1.3	7	0.9
No Response	4	12.1	2	7.4	6	10	16	3.8	13	4.2	29	3.9
Total	33	100	27	100	60	100	425	100	306	100	731	100

Table 18
Shows difference between the responses of Principals and Teachers finding whether the curriculum helps students in their psychomotor development

Helps students in their psychomotor development	Principal					Teachers							
	Private		Government		S.D.	t	Private		Government		S.D.	t	
	N	Score	N	Score			N	Score	N	Score			
Yes	21	63	18	54		df=58	335	1005	236	708		df=729	
Somewhat	7	14	6	12	1.02	0.89	71	142	53	106	0.59	0.64	0.70**
No	1	1	1	1			3	3	4	4			
No Response	4	4	2	2			16	16	13	13			
Total	33	82	27	69			425	1166	306	831			
Mean Score		2.48		2.55				2.74		2.71			

**Not significant at 0.05 level

with 78.8 per cent and 77.1 per cent as private and government teachers respectively. 'Somewhat' was responded by a total of 21.7 per cent principals, out of which 21.2 per cent were private and 22.2 per cent government school principals. Similarly, it was also marked by 16.9 per cent teachers out of which 16.7 per cent were private and 17.3 per cent were government school teachers. A total of 3.3 per cent principals disagreed to the statement, out of which 3 per cent were private and 3.7 per cent were government school principals. In the same way, 0.9 per cent teachers out of which 0.7 per cent was private and 1.3 per cent was government school teachers disagreed to it. Table 17 represents the above data.

Table 18 shows the difference between the responses of principals and teachers finding whether the curriculum helps in the psychomotor development of the students or not. The obtained t-value of private and government school principals is 0.46 which is insignificant at 0.05 level of significance. Similarly, the obtained t-value of private and government school teachers is 0.70 which is also insignificant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, it indicates that both the private and government school principals and teachers' responses do not differ regarding that the curriculum helps in the psychomotor development of the students.

Table 19 assesses if the curriculum helps in developing an aesthetic sense among the students or not. A total of 61.7 per cent principals supported the statement, out of which 63.6 per cent were private and 59.3 per cent were government school principals. Similarly, a total of 68.4 per cent teachers supported the statement, out of which 71.5 per cent were private and 64.0 per cent were government school teachers. ‘Somewhat’ as a response was supported by 30.3 per cent private and 29.6 per cent government principals with a total of 30 per cent. A total of 26.7 per cent teachers also supported this response, out of which 24.2 per cent were private and 30.1 per cent were government school teachers. Not a single private school principal disagreed to the statement while 3.7 per cent government principals disagreed to the statement. Similarly, a total of 1.6 per cent teachers disagreed to the statement, out of which 0.9 per cent were private and 2.6 per cent were government teachers respectively. Table 19 represents the above data.

Table 20 shows the difference between the responses of principals and teachers finding whether the curriculum helps in developing an aesthetic sense among the students or not. The obtained t-value of private and government school principals is 0.49, which is insignificant at 0.05 level of significance indicating that the private and government school principals do not differ regarding

Table 19
Helps in developing aesthetic sense

Helps in developing aesthetic sense among the students	Principal						Teachers					
	Private		Government		Total		Private		Government		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	21	63.6	16	59.3	37	61.7	304	71.5	196	64.1	500	68.4
Somewhat	10	30.3	8	29.6	18	30.0	103	24.2	92	30.1	195	26.7
No	-	-	1	3.7	1	1.7	4	0.9	8	2.6	12	1.6
No Response	2	6.1	2	7.4	4	6.7	14	3.3	10	3.3	24	3.3
Total	33	100	27	100.0	60	100	425	100	306	100	731	100

Table 20
Shows difference between the responses of Principals and Teachers finding whether the curriculum helps in developing aesthetic sense

Helps in developing aesthetic sense among the students	Principal						Teachers						
	Private		Government		S.D.		Private		Government		S.D.		t
	N	Score	N	Score			N	Score	N	Score			
Yes	21	63	16	48			304	912	196	588			df=729
Somewhat	10	20	8	16	0.79	0.88	103	206	92	184	0.59	0.64	2.04*
No	-	-	1	1			4	4	8	8			
No Response	2	2	2	2			14	14	10	10			
Total	33	85	27	67			425	1136	306	790			
Mean Score		2.57		2.48				2.67		2.58			

**Non-significant at 0.05 level

*Significant at 0.05 level

Table 21
CCE is undertaken for understanding of child's knowledge

CCE is undertaken for understanding of child's knowledge	Principal						Teachers					
	Private		Government		Total		Private		Government		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	28	84.8	20	74.1	48	80	325	76.5	204	66.7	529	72.4
Sometimes	1	3.0	3	11.1	4	6.7	76	17.9	80	26.1	156	21.3
Never	3	9.1	3	11.1	6	10	9	2.1	2	0.7	11	1.5
No Response	1	3.0	1	3.7	2	3.3	15	3.5	20	6.5	35	4.8
Total	33	100	27	100	60	100	425	100	306	100	731	100

that the curriculum helps in developing an aesthetic sense among the students. While, the obtained t-value of private and government school teachers is 2.04 which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of private school teachers (2.67) is more than government school teachers (2.58) which indicate that in private schools the curriculum helps in developing an aesthetic sense among the students more in comparison to government schools.

Table 21 shows the responses of the principals and teachers on the statement that CCE is undertaken for understanding of child's knowledge or not. 'Always' as a response was marked by a total of 80 per cent principals, out of which 84.8 per cent were private and 74.1 per cent were government school principals. Similarly, a total of 72.4 per cent teachers marked this response with 76.5 per cent private and 66.7 per cent government teachers. 'Sometimes' was marked by a total of 6.7 per cent principals, out of which 3.0 per cent were private and 11.1 per cent were government school principals. A total of 21.3 per cent teachers also marked this response with 17.9 per cent as private and 26.1 per cent as government school teachers. 'Never' was marked by a total of

Table 22
Shows the difference between the responses of Principals and Teachers finding if CCE is undertaken for understanding of child's knowledge

CCE is undertaken for understanding of child's knowledge	Principal						Teachers					
	Private		Government		S.D.	t	Private		Government		S.D.	t
	N	Score	N	Score			N	Score	N	Score		
Always	28	84	20	60		df=58	325	975	204	612		df=729
Sometimes	1	2	3	6	0.77	0.84	76	152	80	160	0.61	2.89*
Never	3	3	3	3			9	9	2	2		
No Response	1	1	1	1			15	15	20	20		
Total	33	90	27	70			425	1136	306	794		
Mean Score		2.69		2.55				2.70		2.59		

**Not significant at 0.05 level

*Significant at 0.01 level

Table 23
Examination is required to promote the child

Examination is required to promote the child for the next higher class	Principal				Teachers							
	Private		Government		Total		Private		Government		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	29	87.9	22	81.5	51	85	373	87.8	243	79.4	616	84.3
Sometimes	1	3.0	5	18.5	6	10	31	7.3	46	15.0	77	10.5
Never	2	6.1	-	-	2	3.3	11	2.6	2	0.7	13	1.8
No Response	1	3.0	-	-	1	1.7	10	2.4	15	4.9	25	3.4
Total	33	100	27	100	60	100	425	100	306	100	731	100

10 per cent principals, with 9.1 per cent as private and 11.1 per cent as government school principals. In the same way, a total of 1.5 per cent teachers also marked it with 2.1 per cent as private and 0.7 per cent as government school teachers. Table 21 represents the above data.

Table 22 shows the difference between the responses of private and government school principals and teachers by using t-test. The obtained t-value of principals is 0.67, which is insignificant at 0.05 level of significance. It means that private and government schools' principals do not differ regarding that the CCE is undertaken for understanding of child's knowledge. In case of teachers, the t-value is found to be 2.89 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of private school teachers (2.70) is more than government school teachers (2.59). This score is favoring towards private school teachers, so it means that in private schools CCE is undertaken for understanding of child's knowledge more in comparison to government schools.

Table 23 finds out the responses of the principals and teachers on the statement that 'Examination is required to promote the child for the next higher class.' 'Always' was responded by a total of 85 per cent principals, out of which 87.9 per cent were private and 81.5 per cent were government principals. Similarly, an aggregate of 84.3 per cent teachers also responded to it,

out of which 87.8 per cent were private and 79.4 per cent were government teachers. ‘Sometimes’ was responded by a total of 10 per cent principals with 3.0 per cent private and 18.5 per cent as government school principals. In the same way, a total of 10.5 per cent teachers responded to it with 7.3 per cent as private and 15 as government school teachers. ‘Never’ was not marked by any government school principal, but was marked by 6.1 per cent private school principals. An aggregate of 1.8 per cent teachers also marked it, out of which 2.6 per cent were private and 0.7 per cent were government school teachers. Table 24 represents the above data.

Table 24 shows the difference between the responses of private and government school principals and teachers by using t-test. The obtained t-value of principals is 0.37, which is insignificant at 0.05 level of significance. It means that the private and government schools principals do not differ regarding that the examination is required to promote the child for the next higher class. In case of teachers, the t-value is found to be 3.0 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of private

Table 24
Shows the difference between the responses of Principals and Teachers finding if examination is required to promote the child

Examination is required to promote the child for the next higher class	Principal						Teachers					
	Private		Government		S.D.	t	Private		Government		S.D.	t
	N	Score	N	Score			N	Score	N	Score		
Always	29	87	22	66	0.70	df=58	373	1119	250	750	0.65	df=729
Sometimes	1	2	5	10			0.39	0.37**	31	64		
Never	2	1	-	-			11	4	6	6		
No Response	1	1	-	-			10	10	15	15		
Total	33	90	27	76			425	1197	306	827		
Mean Score		2.72		2.81				2.81		2.7		

**Not significant at 0.05 level

*Significant at 0.01 level

school teachers (2.81) is more than government school teachers (2.7). This score is favoring towards private school teachers so it means that in private schools the examination is required to promote the child for the next higher class more in comparison to government schools.

Table 25 assesses if the child is awarded a certificate after completing the elementary education or not. 'Always' was marked by a total of 88.3 per cent principals, out of which 90.9 per cent were private and 85.2 per cent were government school principals. Similarly, an aggregate of 85.2 per cent teachers also responded to it, out of which 87.8 per cent were private and 81.7 per cent were government teachers. 'Sometimes' as a response was marked by a total of 5 per cent principals with 3 per cent as private and 7.4 per cent as government school principals. It was also marked by 8.2 per cent teachers out of which 7.5 per cent and 9.2 per cent were private and government school teachers respectively. 'Never' was not marked by any private and government school principal but, it was marked by a total of 1.4 per cent teachers out of which 0.9 per cent were private and 2.0 per cent were government school teachers.

Table 26 shows the difference between the responses of private and government school principals and teachers by using t-test. The obtained t-value of principals is 0.41, which is insignificant at 0.05 level of significance. It means that private

and government schools' principals do not differ regarding that the child is awarded a certificate after completing the elementary education. In case of teachers, the t-value is found to be 2.7 which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of private school teachers (2.83) is more than government school teachers (2.72). As this score is favoring towards private school teachers, so it means that in private schools the child is awarded a certificate after completing the elementary education more in comparison to government schools.

FINDINGS

Findings regarding the implementation of RTE Act in context of curriculum among private and government elementary school Principals and Teachers are given below:

1. The government schools follow NCF (2005) more in comparison to private schools according to the responses of the principals. The private and government school teachers do not differ in following the NCF (2005).
2. In government schools children are taught in their mother tongue more as compared to private schools which can be seen from the responses of private and government school principals and teachers.
3. The private and government school principals and teachers' responses do not differ regarding that the

- curriculum helps to assess the creativity of the students.
4. The private and government school principals do not differ regarding that the curriculum gives importance to rote memorisation. According to the responses of teachers, the government schools give more importance to rote memorisation in comparison to private schools.
 5. The private and government school principals and teachers' responses do not differ regarding that the curriculum helps to enhance intellect of the students.
 6. In government schools, the curriculum gives emphasis to personality development according to the responses of private and government school principals and teachers.
 7. The private and government schools principals do not differ regarding that the curriculum helps in sharpening the communicative skills of the students. According to the responses of teachers, in private schools the curriculum helps in sharpening the communicative skills of the students more in comparison to government schools.
 8. The private and government schools principals do not differ regarding that the curriculum helps in building the confidence level of the students. According to the responses of teachers, in private schools the curriculum helps in building the confidence level of the students more in comparison to government schools.
 9. The private and government school principals and teachers' responses do not differ regarding that the curriculum helps in the psychomotor development of the students.
 10. The private and government school principals do not differ regarding that the curriculum helps in developing an aesthetic sense among the students. According to the responses of teachers, in private schools the curriculum helps in developing an aesthetic sense among the students more in comparison to government schools.
 11. The private and government schools principals do not differ regarding that the CCE is undertaken for understanding of child's knowledge. According to the responses of teachers, in private schools CCE is undertaken for understanding of child's knowledge more in comparison to government schools.
 12. The private and government school principals do not differ regarding that the examination is required to promote the child for the next higher class. According to the responses of teachers, in private schools the examination is required to promote the child

for the next higher class more in comparison to government schools.

13. The private and government school principals do not differ regarding that the child is awarded a certificate after completing the elementary education. According to the responses of teachers, in private schools the child is awarded a certificate after completing the elementary education more in comparison to government schools.

IMPLICATIONS

1. NCF (2005) is still not followed in many government and private schools. The present study highlights the need of proper monitoring and counseling of the administrators and teachers belonging to private schools more in comparison to government schools.
2. The private schools should be encouraged more in comparison to the government schools to teach the students in their mother tongue as already mentioned in NCF (2005) and RTE Act- 2009. The present study emphasises

on the need of mother tongue for effective school education.

3. School environment should be made child friendly, which is free of stress and fear that will definitely enhance the creativity and intellect in the students of elementary school.
4. The present study elucidates that all norms and provisions given in the RTE Act-2009, regarding curriculum should be properly understood by the principals and teachers so that these can be effectively implemented by them.

CONCLUSIONS

The present paper has assessed the implementation of the provisions of the RTE Act-2009 in context of curriculum by the private and government elementary schools of the western Uttar Pradesh. The responses of the principals and teachers of the private and government schools are depicted by calculating percentages, means and S.D., which are shown in the tabular form. It clearly shows that some of the provisions of RTE Act, 2009 in context of curriculum are being implemented by all elementary schools and some are not because of many reasons.

REFERENCES

- BAIRAGYA, R. AND S. Bairagya. 2011. Right to Education Act: A Critical Analysis, *Edusearch*. Vol. 2, No. 2. pp. 125–128, Researcher's Organisation, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh, India, ISSN 0976-1160.
- REKHA, C. 2011. Access Provisions under the RTE Act (2009) and SSA. *The Primary Teacher*. (Vol. XXXVI, No. 1&2. January and April 2011) NCERT, New Delhi.
- SHARMA, M. AND N.Y. Shafeeq. 2016. An analysis of the implementation of RTE Act, 2009 in Aligarh District. Vol. 3, No. 6. pp. 2191–2214. *The International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention* ISSN: 2349-2031
- THE RIGHT OF CHILDREN TO FREE AND COMPULSORY EDUCATION ACT, 2009. The Gazette of India, published by Authority (Ministry of Law and Justice).

© NCERT
not to be republished